Mr. Nyland: So, we'll assume everybody is here, June?

June Kroeger: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Nyland: Who is from L.A.? Oh? It's the first time that, uh, New York is kind of outnumbered. No. I wouldn't say that. Huh? In San Francisco there are more. Have you ever recorded any discussions so far? None. But you have listened to some tapes. And because of that, maybe, you have questions? Maybe not so easy to ask, even if you do have a question. What will we talk a . . . yeah? Go ahead.

QUESTION: From the, uh, tapes, I've gotten the impression that the, uh, flash of consciousness people are supposed to be able to achieve, you know, out of the everyday state is something that we can, uh, achieve flashes of pretty readily, and we talked a little bit about that and nobody really knew for sure exactly how readily one was supposed to be able to achieve that and what it was like. Know what I mean?

MR. NYLAND: Yeah. I know what you mean. Can you?

QUESTION: It's hard to say.

MR. NYLAND: And how is the case with other people?

QUESTION: Everyone seemed to agree that they weren't sure what it was or how they' d describe it.

MR. NYLAND: What aren't they sure?

QUESTION: Uh, they weren' t sure what the experience was, or they weren't sure that they would . . .

MR. NYLAND: And how did you solve it? Now, how did you tell, because if you had an experience, perhaps you could describe it a little. You see, even if it was a flash, and even if it happens only once, you may be able to describe that particular experience. If you don't, then of course you don' t know if you had any experiences of that type, and then of course nobody knows that you're talking about. So, here in the midst of an unconscious state . . . We don't smoke.

VOICE: Mmmm.

MR. NYLAND: I'm sorry. I have to make that rule; let me explain. Because we are talking about something that is important, and it is something that is not ordinary life, and we eliminate then, if we possibly can, any kind of ordinary thing which is usually a habit, in order to be able to concentrate a little bit more about what we are going to talk. So, it is not that I object to the continuation of ordinary life, but that at this particular time, we should try to get away from it a little bit, in order to see what we can do in order to be free from ordinary life.

Whenever a person has an experience of a different kind in the midst of his so-called unconscious state, he will be able to describe that experience as being different. Because, you see, if it is no different, then of course it is a continuation of ordinary life. Now, if I say I would like to describe a state in which I think I have a little bit more objectivity, I'll have to define what is really meant by being objective, and then I'm immediately back to that what

is a description of objectivity that I want to achieve when I follow a certain method. So in the method it must already be indicated what I want to achieve. IfI want to go from here to New York, I have to mention to myself that I want to go to New York, and, surely, for a definite reason. If in the midst of an unconscious state I would like to become conscious, I have to try to describe what is this conscious state that I'm after, and something that I then of course believe is much more desirable than the continuation of an unconscious state. So then when it comes down to the point of how will I go from one state into another, assuming for a moment that it is more desirable, then I must know what I'm talking about-- what this particular state is/that I would like to reach.So then going to be one tries to define what is a conscious state. That is, that if I now believe that a man has at the present time mental faculties, and they are at the present time not sufficient to be called conscious, or rather if I think that in the unconscious state I may have a thought of a different kind of a state, I have to start to describe what is meant by it. If I say, now, consciousness, or a different kind of a level, I can make different kind of definitions for it. In the first place I can say it, there is, well, it is objective, it is something that is non-subjective. Well, if I look at myself as subject, or as constantly being in a subjective state, and I know, say, it has to be something non-subjective, I exclude practically every experience I have, but by definition "subjective" means all the manifestations we human beings in general have on Earth, and it is almost identical by saying that the

person as a human being living on Earth all the time manifests a form of subjectivity. You may be different from different people, but all of them are subjective. So now when I try to think about what is really a conscious state, and I say it is non-subjective, and I eliminate everything that I now at the present time know by experience, then I have a very hard time really to indicate what is meant by objectivity. So when I say, now, "objectivity," do I know anything about it in ordinary life, and sometimes one says I can be objective about certain things that happen because they leave me cold. You know, to some extent, this is objectivity. Because I' m not involved in it, and, you might say, the further I go away from it the better my perspective will be, and although I may lose a little contact because I go farther away, it, simply means that as long as I can still see it, or know that it exists, then I say, regarding that, I have an impression. But the impression is not mixed with any feeling because it leaves me cold. This is one way by which I start to reach a certain conclusion which is a little bit in line with objectivity. When a judge has to pronounce a sentence, he has to weigh all the factors, and bring about a balance between the pros and cons, and finally he gives the sentence to whatever the murderer has done. And he hopes that is fair, and he hopes that he is not persuaded in any way, one way or another, by the fact that the man in front of him may be a friend, or may be somebody he really feels pity for. He still has to pronounce judgment. This kind of judgment is based on a state of pro and con and weighing one against the other, so that finally he reaches a state of balance or equilibrium, and with that, he says,

my judgment is fair, because it is as objective as I can make it.

So here is another, this question of balance, the question of being in equilibrium regarding that what I happen to see, or what I happen to notice in some way, or, with which I happen to be connected, and then in that kind of a relation I have to say something about it which, you might say, comes closest to the truth when it is not affected by my personal interpretation. Now the question is, how can I, as a person, become objective to myself? If it has to be an impartial one, then of course, from my mental functioning I have to exclude everything in the direction of a feeling, or in the direction of liking it or disliking it, and then I say if that is entirely eliminated, or, what I said a little while ago, when it leaves me cold, then of course I am more objective. So, the requirement now is I say I want to find out what is the state of objectivity, and if it were possible for me to reach it, I have to exclude out of my mental functioning everything that has to do with a feeling. Now, again, if I now say if a man can function that way, doI reach objectivity? Again, whenI look at the mind when it is now forming certain thoughts, and as it is now associated with thoughts, and as I have memory, and as my mind is able to function in such a way that I can anticipate that what will take place, then considering the mind as it is now functioning, is it sufficient for me that it could register absolute facts?

Now the word "absolute" simply means that I want to reach the truth about myself. And again if I say I want to be truthful in the

accumulation of the facts about myself, it has to have a definite purpose why I want to be truthful. And that is very difficult to define. Because what do I need the truth for? If I live an ordinary life, I get along very well when I tell a little lie once in awhile, as long as it doesn't get me into prison, and not into trouble with the different people who perhaps rely on what I am saying, and evenif they catch me, naturally, being clever enough, I can explain that I really didn't mean it that way, and of course immediately I start to rationalize about certain things that I have done, and I don't want to be called on the carpet that I did something wrong, because I don't like that, and I would feel a little bit ashamed. And ifI apply the same kind of reasoning to that what I would like to know about myself, and if I say, regarding myself, that I want to have facts that are absolute, of course, I have a terribly difficult time, because I know that whatever thoughts I have and whatever feelings, they are always tinted with an idea that I like myself more or less, and if I don't like certain things I will try to explain it, and again I use the same rationalization process for myself, in looking at myself, for the simple reason that I like myself, and I want to continue living with myself, and I cannot dislike myselfall the time, because I will have to find a reason why I am behaving this way or that way, and when that behavior in my mind is not all that it is supposed to be, and whatever I think that it has to be inaccordance with the way I have been educated and whatever is my morality, so then naturally if I do do it, and I would have to admit it, I don't like it about

myself because my particular opinion about myself is kind of attractive. So, for that reason, one canask, can a man actually stand the truth about himself? He can stand the truth when in respect to that what he so-called "sees," and I still use that word "sees," that is, he "notices" certain facts about himself when he can remain in equilibrium.

So you see we introduce now something that is required in ordinary life for objectivity. We use the same kind of concept. When I can be at ease with myself, accepting that what I am without feeling or even wishing, or perhaps logically determining that I want to correct it, but when I can be regarding myself impersonal, even when that what I am doing is the expression of my personality, then I get a little bit more of an idea what it is if my mind could function in such a way it would be at least partly objective and partly subjective. Now the reason why I want the truth is because I want to use it for myself, and when I say I want to use it, it means that that what I am I want to hope that somehow or other the way I am, and I am not such a fool about myself because I know really whatI am even if it is by memory I have an approximate idea about what I am, the question is, am Iin such a way capable of using what I have for the possibility of further development. Now you see this is immediately touching on the reason why I want to Work. Because if I don't think that I ought to develop, if I think that I am already there, and that in the natural course of events, by having more and more experiences in ordinary life, I will reach a certain height of satisfaction, then, quite logically, I am not interested in developing,

even if it were a little faster, I would leave it to my ordinary experience in life because I know that when I am young I only know this much, and when I am older, I hope, I will become more mature. So, anyone who is interested simply in considering his life logically, not as yet completely, but which will be completed in time, that then such a person is not interested in Work whatsoever, but expects that the continuation of experiences in life will give him what he really needs.

The question of course is much deeper. Because if I am satisfied with life as it is, and hope that in my old age I will be a very nice, kind, good man, and I hope then that that actually will take place in my case, all I have to do is to look around and to see that there are many of such nice, old men around, who because of old age have matured in such a way that I would like, that is, I would like to take from this example. So, you can always say, well, it doesn' t make any difference what happened to someone else, because I want to be conceited enough to think that I will be quite different from someone and perhaps one is justified to a certain extent, because maybe if one sets out with the idea that one can change and wants to change and that in time I will change, and with that having in mind I start to work in ordinary life. And when I become impressed about what is the development of myself in ordinary life, and I don't want to be a liar regarding myself, I will notice that in many, many cases, I have absolutely no control over what I am doing, and that even if I say I would like to do this or that, and I am reasonable about it, that my feeling will oppose it,

and if the feeling doesn't oppose it, my body opposes it. And that there is sometimes this conflict (splice here). And that as soon as I reach the state of the beginning of maturity, and I look at my life as something that I find myself with regardless of being grateful that I was born, I simply have to make the best of it, because I happen to live on Earth, and, for whatever the reason, I will assume the responsibility, to say the least, of maintaining myself. In many cases, of course, I have to do much more. I have to learn, be able to learn a trade, or something that is intellectually possible to be put into use, and economically I am bound by the conditions in which I am, and dependent now upon the total amount of education I have, it is also time that I start to earn my own living, unless I am particularly fortunate that someone else, like my father, has a lot of money, and I don't have to do very much. I think most of us are not in that particular position. So, I will take responsibility for the maintenance of my life, and I will take it also to be able to continue to live under the conditions where I happen to live, and earn enough money within reason. I also take on responsibilities of my own--not necessarily those that have been given to me because I happen to live and my mother is sick, and I have to take care of her, but I myself as a human being have of course certain wishes, and when I have in mind that I want to build a house or that I would like a car or that I want to get married or that I want to be good and nice and kind to the blind, and that for that reason I want to have a little extra money, all of that are responsibilities I put on myself in order to make my life richer.

Now, from here you can go two ways. Either you consider that that is all there is to it, and that when I live my life as well as I can, that then at the end I am not going to be bothered by all kind of Christian ideas that perhaps St. Peter will ask me for my passport before he lets me into Heaven. And that perhaps during such a period of taking on a responsibility, I have acquired something that I call a conscience. And the conscience may be developed because I happen to live under certain conditions of ethics, or perhaps my education has gone in a religious sense that I now must go to church every Sunday. In any event, I consider the possibility of becoming a man for myself in such a way that it is going to cost me a great deal of energy to get there somehow or other. And that I hopw thatI, when my life begins at forty, that at least I am already at a certain plateau.

Well, why should I wish, during this lifetime, to acquire absolute facts about myself? Because if I assume that logically I will grow out into a nice, good man, then I don't need absoluteness. Because for absoluteness I would have to go out of my way to try to find out what it really is. And it is undoubtedly difficult because I am so used to be a little bit hypocritical. And as long as everybody else knows that everybody else is also a little hypocritical, and that a little bit of a lie is not so bad when it doesn' t get me into prison, and because of that I can live very well with this kind of a condition, then I will not judge someone else, and someone else will not judge me either. Because they all know what I am. And when they find out that I am reliable, only during

the week and not on Sunday, then of course they will exclude the possibilities of trusting me on Sunday. I mean that I have continually certain conditions that I make adjustments with. And all of this requires thought and a feeling, energy on my part, sacrifice many times, and then I will consider that at the end of my life when I die, and I know I will die--it will not be right away, and I hope not tomorrow--but sometime there will be an end, and because of that I consider my life useful when I have reached . . . what? This is the whole point.

What is it that I really aim for? What is it in my life that is sufficiently important that I can leave when I die, if there is something that I could leave, or, that during the time when I work for it will give me enough enjoyment, enough satisfaction, that I can leave my life the way it is without any regrets. Now, I am afraid that if one looks at one' s life that way that there is always the risk that you may not be satisfied. And that one usually says, "Well, you never can tell." Although I now try to do the best I can, I know that in many instances I cannot do what I want to do. And that gradually out of this acceptance of a responsibility comes also, can I consider conditions in such a way that I could change them, so that I then with my responsibility can actually get worth for my money. I think a person is entitled to it. That whenever he takes effort. . . . that whenever he makes effort in ordinary life, that with that he is entitled to the results that he gets. And that therefore, if that were the case, again, I would be at ease regarding

my own life. All this simply means if people who are interested in objectivity have to be people who are not satisfied. Anyone who is smug enough or hopes that it will come in any event and that without doing too much about it somehow or other circumstances will help them, he is not the kind of person who ever could be interested in trying to become conscious.

Now, if people happen to have questions, what are those questions? In the first place, if life as we live it now on Earth is the end, then we die. Is there some possibilities of a continuation, or do I have to consider all the expenditures during this lifetime as being completely finished the moment when I die. I talk about death a great deal now because it is very necessary when I consider life that I must consider also the possibility of not having it. So that if I actually remember that I will die, maybe then I will live, or try to live a little better. So if I look at it now from that standpoint, what is the value of my life at the present time? Will I be satisfied when everything simply dies with me? Again, when that question comes up, and I say it's quite all right, thenI am not a candidate for Work in the sense of consciousness.

There has to be another particular reason why I want to be interested. That is, the condition in which I am at the present time is so terrible or obnoxious or so disagreeable, or there are so many questions I cannot solve, that I am looking for an answer, almost I would say in any kind of a direction, and that I either become religious or that I become a philosopher, or maybe a scientist, or maybe an actor, besides being an ordinary fellow who earns his

living in ordinary life economically. Again I say, if there is nothing of that kind in a person of those four different qualifications, he again is not a candidate for Work.

That is why Gurdjieff calls people on Earth slugs. Because they have no particular reason for wanting to live, and only the continuation of their slug state. And that there is no aspiration towards anything else, and that life as it is now lived or I have to live it, and I wish to make the adjustments, so then I am completely satisfied, so then again I have closed myself completely from a wish to develop in a certain direction.

Now, this development of a direction, in order to define it, if I say that in either science or philosophy which perhaps may be a mental quality, or in art or religion which may be an emotional one, I will reach a certain point of myself in which there is equilibrium, it is as if those are the four directions waiting in one point as a cross in whichthat at that one point each person along the line reaching towards his point will come to the same conclusion of that what is truth for them, even if theyyhave reached it through different means. The truth at such a time will set them free from that what they have been travelling on, which was a certain length of time, spending their energies during that lifetime for the acquisition of certain dexterities or insights. And that therefore this question of truth is really much deeper. Because regardless of what I am doing in ordinary life, I know that I am constantly bound, and this question of identification with that what I am doing--and of course I have to give up when I die--

will I be ready to give it up?

It brings up this whole point of, "Can I in my lifetime do what I want to do?" And if I remain alive, I will also know that regardless of how long I live, I will never have enough time. Now these are statements perhaps a little bit philosophical, but surely not theoretical. Because if I consider my life as I now wish to live it, there are again four different ways that I can consider it.

One is the relationship that I have with my conscience. My conscience--it doesn' t matter how it was made or how it got there, nevertheless it for me at times a certain voice or something that happens to talk to me, or where I at times go to in order to find out what is right or wrong. If I am religiously inclined I I would consider it the voice of God, and to come in contact with it I would have to pray. But whatever it is that I feel religiously, at the same time, even if I make it very thin; and I can call it an ethical form of behavior, I still have to have some kind of a norm with which I compare that what I am doing or allowing myself to think or to feel, the responsibility for one's life now is not only that I maintain myself. It is the question of how do I spend that what is given or what I have, and if there is the possibility of the acquisition of more, then I would like to have a conscience, which is much more truthful than I ordinarily have in ordinary life. This eliminates, of course, immediately, all the different things that have been pushed on to

me that I call "ethical values" which are not at all my own, which simply have been taught by my father and family and the teachers and so forth, and I simply have accepted them. Sometimes they say it is God's law, or in any event it's the way I have to behave because I live on Earth, and there are sociological requirements. How to get out of it? Because what is really my own? When I live on Earth, and when I breathe in the atmosphere of the Earth, and when I have been educated and have had contacts with the different people that I live with, how can I have a conscience that remains my own? You see, the three different directions in addition to this private one, which is what I call the conscientious one, is of course my personal life in the first place. It's the relationship I have with people I care for, and they care for me. It is intimate, and it is the kind of relationship in which I can let my hair down, hoping that I will be understood and I will feel at home. And it centers of course in the first place around family, about man, wife, husband, and so forth, children, and also nearest friends. People I can really trust. It goes over in a certain kind of relationship I call professional, in which I, you might say, earn my living, and which I have certain acquaintanceship because I happen to see the people, they like me or dislike me more or less but I can get along, and it is not intimate, to be called personal. Sometimes it goes over into it and I am perhaps very lucky. Sometimes I like to do what I am supposed to do and sometimes I don' t at all, but nevertheless I do it. There is a fourth one. . You see you understand now the private relation is my own. The second one

is with my nearest family or groups of friends. The third one is a much looser relationship. But in all three there is a relationship of something that I know about, because I have a contact direct with people, or privately I have a contact with my own conscience and I call it God when I pray. But the sociological relationship is quite different. And at the same time, people who are living in, in this life on Earth, they have an influence on many other people without knowing it, and particularly when it becomes pronounced in any one of those four directions I mentioned. If you become a scientist, or a philosopher or an artist or a religious man, or when they are in professional life connected with large organizations, and they reach their executive level, or when in ordinary life they become politicians, or labor leaders, or criminals, all of them create because of their activities certain conditions for ordinary people and sometimes extraordinary ones without knowing who they affect. If I write a book I don' t know who is going to read it. I hope a lot of people, and many of them I'm sure I won't know. If I create art, I hope that people not only will like it, but that my name will go down in posterity for ever and ever. IfI preach, I do not know everyone I talk to, particularly when I preach over the radio. In any kind of a religious sense, any kind of a church, any kind of a so-called dogmatic or even a doctrine of that what is pronounced now being the law for following certain religious facts or practices, logically will affect many people who want to adhere to it, and I myself per-

haps as an originator may not know who is affected. Politically, if I make laws, I affect practically everybody in this country, If I am an executive, I don't know the people who are working for me way down below the line, because it is not a personal relationship anymore; it's not a one-man organization. It's a group that has become a system. And in many cases I don' t know who is affected when I say everybody has to be there at nine o'clock in the morning. It may be very inconvenient and maybe some people suffer. And they cannot make it. Some people get sick, and all they _____ _____. two weeks sick leave. And maybe they are very sick, and maybe they have trouble with their wives, and their children, and so forth, and I force them to come to the office or to the factory. When I am a labor leader, and I negotiate, all the certain unions we have to follow, and even if they in sympathy strike with someone else we are in some trouble. I am affected by that whatever is the law that they make. So you see, whichever way I go, I really don't know how many people it will affect as soon as it becomes a little bit more pronounced. Now all of this simply means that the totality of our lives at the present time is very complicated, and that man when he is living, and he touches in different directions in these kind of possibilities where he shows towards them/the certain facets of his personality, the more all-around he is, the more chance there is for him not only to become well-known, but to adapt himself. And the less all-around he is, the more difficulty he will have to continue to live in accordance with certain principles. All of this requires, if I want

to know myself as I am, I cannot be dependent on my relationships with different people, because there is too much in fault on my part to adjust myself to certain conditions, and many times I don't know how to adjust. Regarding this, this particular problem, of what you might call self-knowledge I have really not enough data about myself. All I know is what I remember. When I bring it to the foreground again in the recalling, I am not quite sure that it actually was so. And I say when I see this and that disagreeable, I start to improvise. The question of truth is something that I have to settle for myself, if I actually want to have it, not primarily for the purpose of being able to live on Earth. It has to be considered from the standpoint of something that could develop on Earth in the direction of consciousness and real conscience. And it's for that reason I'm interested in that what I am to know exactly that that is so, and there is no other way about it. Not only that I want to make sure myself that that what is the truth for myself, but if it is absolute it has to be acceptable to everybody. And so now the definitions of Objectivity. We are now complete. In the first place I have to notice things because I have to be alive, when I want to study myself as having the foundation for further development, I have to collect data about myself. These data have to be exact. So I say they have to be im= partial, because in the collection of data and when my mind starts to function in accumulation of facts and when they have to be truthful and in that sense absolute, they must be impartial. And also, I will reach the absoluteness only when I can eliminate my ordinary

thoughts. Because ordinary thoughts give me a particular possibility of an association with that what has gone on before and with an anticipation of what is going to come. And I maybe look into the future, but it will not give me the reality of the existence at the present time. So my mind, when I consider it as an instrument, is quite faulty for the purpose of bringing me truth. Truth for me is reality. Truth is that what exists now, not what has existed and not what is going to exist. That is not truthful and it is not reality. Therefore the reality I will only find when I know an experience of a present. That my presence to that what I experience has to be a recorded fact for myself. Objectivity then is defined as a form of noticing in which the mental functioning are not in accordance with ordinary mental processes. We call it Awareness. And I say that this noticing, if it could become awareness, as being free from my feeling, is then real observation. And if real observation exists and it is impartial, that then real impartiality can only exist when I experience the moment when it happens, and not allow my thoughts in any way to interfere. Then I have defined what it is to become objective. Then I say if that objective state exists in my mind, my mind is conscious. If that objective fact exists in my feeling center, my feeling center becomes conscience. And if it exists in my ordinary wishes of what I now consider activities of the physical body, as a result of that what I think and feel, then I will have a real will, because my will then is the result of that what is my consciousness and my conscience.

So there is now the picture of Man in the first place the way

he is; in the second place, the way he should become. If I hope that that is possible, I have to be much stronger about the realization that it is possible for me. Because I don' t care if Gurdjiefffwrites about it. And all the different people who profess that they are Working in accordance with Gurdjieff's rules, have no meaning, because what happens to someone may not happen to me. And their experience doesn' t do me any good. I don' t profit at all by a description of Ouspensky when he was in St. Petersburg, and was exposed to Gurdjieff. All he does is describe what his reactions were, and of course he tries then to explain what is meant by Working, but to what extent he does that, again, if I don't take out of that book what I must do in order to have a similar experience like Ouspensky, or what I have to apply in accordance with whatever Gurdjieff indicates in <u>All and Everything</u>, it will have no meaning whatsoever and only remain in a little theory which has applied to someone else and perhaps has made him very happy, but it has not done me any good, as long as it stays in my own little mind as the result of reading. So the emphasis of Gurdjieff is always, either you take it and you find out, and if you don't take it you never will find out.

So the purpose of groups is to be able to talk about the possible application of the ideas that one knows something about, hoping that then what one tries to apply is in accordance with what is the truth about what is Work on oneself. This is in the first place. In the second place, if it applies to someone else, and it doesn' t do me any good, I want to know if it will apply to

me, and if, by my own experience, I can reach the state of objectivity. Now that's very difficult because I'm totally subjective. And then I start to think about what I have experienced. Have there been moments in my life that I actually could say that was an objective experience? You see we simply classify these moments as moments I do not forget, in which I knew I existed and in which I also knew, afterwards, that I really didn't think or feel. And the registration then of that existence became an absolute fact for me. Because there was no question, and of course I don't even want to argue about it, because if someone denies it, he is not living my experience. The fact that such an objective experience can take place accidentally, because I haven't done anything about it, it only happens because conditions were that way. And I experience, for instance, in the presence of possible death of myself, or a certain shock of news that I receive that is entirely different than that what I expected--you might say it has given me a slap in my face or a blow of some kind--that this kind of a shock produces in me a state, and the state is earmarked by one thing: I know my existence, but I also know I have no thought or no feeling about it. When once I have experienced these kind of moments I will not forget, and everyone has them, with no doubt, at times, in certain conditions of their life, sometimes there is more than one. But when the possibility exists for me to experience it, then I also know that if I can find a way of how to make it, that my body, or whatever are the organs of my existence, can actually register that kind of a condition. So then, . . . what is it?

QUESTION: I have a question.

MR. NYLAND: Yah, but why would you now interrupt me?

QUESTION: I'm sorry.

MR. NYLAND: Yah, it is not right. Because to some extent, I am trying to develop an idea. It is perfectly all right to ask questions, but let' s wait just for a moment. All right with you?

QUESTION. All right.

MR. NYLAND: Because a certain thing that has to be added to this, if I believe that it can exist and there is a method, if I know that moments of objectivity can be experienced by me, then I still have to have the wish of producing that in accordance with that what is prescribed as Work. And then I now without knowing what is the condition of consciousness, I know the road that will lead to it, and that I say it is earmarked by the different factors which are called always A, B and C, as that what I have to fulfill, as an observation process which is impartial and which is simultaneous, that then if I try to do this, then in accordance with the intensity or the presence of all three, I will reach a certain state which I know will be different from my ordinary state of unconsciousness, and if I don't know it, I don' t Work. Or I don' t know how, or I have to learn how to learn to Work. So all those who have flashes and not knowing what it is like, they are

not Working. A person who Works at one moment can experience that what is registered as his existence. There for me is absolutely no question about that. If one sits quiet, and you close your eyes, one can become aware of oneself existing without use of any of the sense organs. When I exclude my sense organs, which give me impressions, then there is something that apparently can still register, and it does not go through my ordinary mind in the ordinary way. Now one can argue about it, because I have memory when I close my eyes, I remember how I felt. So I can say that that what comes to my consciousness, and what I would like to call an awareness may still be the memory of what I remember it to be. When I now move my hand, stretch out my arm, make a fist, and extend my fingers, or twist my body in a certain way, it is different, I keep my eyes closed. I don't see it; I don't see it in any ordinary way. I am aware of the existence of myself moving. And if one is very fussy about that, you can still say that it is the result in your ordinary mind, because when I move my muscles, I am so used to know from the muscular movement that certain things are taking place, that I can have a memory of that as a result of these muscular tensions, which will give me the knowledge of that that I have moved, also, that I exist because of that. So you see how difficult it is to establish a fact of objectivity for myself. If now on the other hand I do certain things that are quite out of the ordinary which I have not done as yet, or so seldom that I have no memory of them, when I stand on my head, when I twist my body into the most uncomfortable kind of position, when I go through the trouble of actually

making performances, and all the time keeping my eyes closed, if I then can retain this sense of awareness, which is nothing else than the registration of my existence, then I know that I am aware and not thinking. Again I say, the question of how do I find out is by putting this particular little thing to practice. And then I will, in having this experience as awareness, a certain recognition of my existence, and it will leave me with a very definite impression. The difficulty now is, when I now become aware of the way I am, that what I am, I may not like. And I will be critical about it. The criticalness of course is my ordinary mind or a little bit of feeling. And now when I say, I wish to become conscious, I see that I have no instrument that can even function in that kind of a way. Because as soon as I notice with my ordinary mind, even if I try to become impartial, it's an impossibility. So then, in order to overbridge that, and to get out of that particular dilemma, I have to create something that doesn' t exist asyet.

So you see, this whole question of objectivity, you might say, has now shifted to something that I start to call by the name of "i." The realization of that "i" is the result of the necessity of creating it, because nothing in my personal makeup, everything being subjective, is capable of functioning in the ordinary sense of now what I describe as an Objective Faculty. Now we leave that point and you come, and can ask your question.

QUESTION: I simply want to know what you mean by feeling. Um, when you described it earlier, that is, under the sensation of

liking or disliking, well if you mean feeling as we ordinarily think of it in the broad sense.

MR. NYLAND: The question of feeling . . .

QUESTION: . . . do you distinguish thought as being . . .

MR. NYLAND: is sometimes . . .

QUESTION: . . . ordinarily must not have . . . at a moment of consciousness, or whatever

MR. NYLAND: Well, you're using now a hell of a lot of words that have absolutely no meaning. Feeling is very simple. When I feel I am in a certain state, and sometimes I'd say I like or dislike, sometimes I experience anger, I experience jealousy, I experience elation--these are feelings where something takes place in my solar plexus. How I know it is a manifestation of my body, and sometimes I say that is a sensation, because my body takes on a certain form in accordance with whatever is my feeling. You see, if we start to question this distinction of the three centers, and that I don' t know what feeling is, I' m really talking through my hatThere is very definitely something that takes place in the solar plexus of a person which I call a rate of vibration which gives me excitement of a certain kind. A difference of blood circulation, even, or a state of my physical body which is not the result of either the thought or something that is affecting the physical body as such, like a blow. When I talk about a religion,

I have a feeling in relation to that what is a deity. When I talk about art, I have a very definite feeling of wanting to relate something unusual in the form of, let' s call it an artistic achievement. If I am a scientific man, my feeling may be a little bit further in the background, but nevertheless when I'm really inventive and wish to create things that do not exist as yet, and that I say for the lot of my work I experience regarding scientific research certain states that sometimes I will never forget, Philosophically of course there is quite definitely a feeling involved in the wish to pursue whatever some other philosopher has written and then to see how he has explained the different riddles of the universe. Did you actually mean that you don' t know your feeling or not?

QUESTION: I'm not so sure I can distinguish the thought.

ANSWER: No, that is right. You cannot distinguish. I am only saying that they exist, that they flow over. That of course is obvious. If I still say about . . . the three centers existing, I do it only for the sake of having something that is more or less understood by a variety of people. If I become a saint, or a monk, I utilize something in me that can be called a feeling towards a deity I want to reach. If I am mystically inclined, I am not trying to do it intellectually. I do it by means of a higher emotional possibility for myself, hoping that somehow, some day, I will have a chance to meet with that what is my godhead. I talk then about feeling, and as much as I can, perhaps a little bit pure and

simple, because, particularly when I want to become a saint or a monk, I exclude all kind of other intellectual activities, or even I deny all desires of my body, and I even chastise it. What I do retain is love, and noone will deny that love, affection, sometimes consideration, sometimes going over into a terminology which is mental when I try to describe it, but when I say I have love for a flower or an animal, I don't describe it because I feel it. If on the other hand, my feeling, as it is, asa feeling center and functioning, will need a form of expression, and because of that it is unfortunate, you might say, that in the human body it is so closely related to the conditions of the physical body, so that that what is an expression of one' s feelings, that is the manifestation in the physical sense, it is the limitation of man. What we really ought to be able to do is to have independent centers which can function on their own, and if necessary can be related by something that knows the value of all things. Can we agree on that particular point? Because if you're not clear about that, you have to keep on thinking. What is really a feeling for you? There are of course people where their feeling center is very little developed, and they are sometimes quite superficial, and sometimes they are much too intellectual. And, even at that, at times, when they are physically developed, they have a love for their bodies. Where does that come from? When they want to investigate intellectually, they have a wish. Where does that wish come from? It is not intellectual, because, if it is intellect, and it is pure research, it surely is cold.

When I make distinctions in my own state of being hot or cold, where does the heat come from? Reason, logic . . . not in the least. But of course it is I would almost say so obvious that a person living on Earth has a feeling, even if he cannot locate where it is. I say it is in, more or less centered in the solar plexus, and I think it can be proven. Because there are definitely conditions when my heart goes a little pitter-patter, you know when it never starts to be effective. If someone dies, do I feel it? Or do I stop reading about it? Of course it's nonsense. A person has a feeling. It may not be very much developed, and it may be completely attached to his physical body, and sometimes his mind starts to interfere with the feeling, or tries to reason about it. Naturally, in ordinary life, a man is a complicated creature, in which the three centers are mixed. But nevertheless, there may be certain things that I make; there are also as an average something that is definitely different from the physical existence, different from a mental function. Can we leave it at that? Because if you're not clear, you will never understand Gurdjieff's work. It has to be quite fundamentally understood, that man is made up of three different functions of himself within him, and that there are organs to take care of that. Wherever the seat of one's physical existence may be, it may be rather difficult to say, and perhaps it is Kundalini or Kundabuffer, may be, it is at the bottom of his spine, and maybe there are certain functions that belong purely to physical, or even instinctive or motivation, of motor quality.

Feelingly, or emotionally, that what a man is as a solar plexus could become an emotion that is transferred to his heart. The difficulty that it is connected with the physical body is simply that there are nerve nodes which are now distributed over the body and not centered in the solar plexus. Feelings for a man are the stage which can be compared with the planetary level, and whenever I describe Venus and Jupiter and Mars and so forth as being a certain planet, I describe them as having emotional qualities. That is where the difference between the planets exists. It is not mental. Well, whatever takes place in the brain, you can call it whatever you like. Certainly it is the center in which mental processes go on. It is necessary to understand that from the very beginning. Because if there is any question, then it is quite useless to talk about Work. When I have to have a wish for Work, it has to come from my feeling. The purer it is, the more it becomes emotional. I make a distinction between a feeling, which is ordinary, and an emotion, which is not ordinary. A feeling belongs to Earth, as human beings are; an emotion belongs to a man when he aspires to become a different kind of a man, not necessarily of Earth. So you can also say an emotion is really in an artist or a religious man when he contemplates the possibility of the creation of something--either an artistic object, or that what is the relationship towards his god. That was a distinction I simply made because it is a little easier, because not everything is emotional, although we misuse the words, and we don't

know enough about the difference of why really a feeling center is so closely connected to the physical, and that whenever there is a state in oneself as the result of a mood, it may be a mood produced by a feeling, it may be because of the intellect. We are very, very far removed from an exact language, when we consider that.

To come back to the question of objectivity, if a center exists like the mind, which is incapable of having an objectivity take place in it as an experience, I have to create something that can actually function also mentally, but will only be intellectual in recording the facts as they are, and accepting them. This Gurdjieff calls, of course, that what is the objective faculty. He says it is situated on Mars. And he says that there is a telescope. And he says that Beelzebub is looking at things that take place on Earth. Of course it's allegory. I don' t know if Beelzebub ever was on Mars. Maybe he was or was not. But for me it is a picture. It is the creation of something where I should be an observer, and that what is a telescope is an instrument which enables me to observe certain conditions on Earth. What is Earth? My body. And that' s why I say the three centers are important, because I find them in myself, as Earth, my body; as my feeling, the planets; as my mind, the Sun.

In addition, as far as our Solar System is concerned, there are planetoids. They are not real planets; they are planets in fragments, you might say, in search of becoming a planet. These are the little nerve nodes of the physical body which as yet are

not united in the solar plexus. The observer, which is Beelzebub, is an objective faculty looking at me. What is me is Earth, and it's quite definitely indicated, that as far as Work on oneself is concerned, it starts with the observation of Earth. It's very interesting. Because so many times I say observation should of course be that I become conscious of the totality of myself, and I would love to observe my feelings, and I would love to observe my mental capacity. And all of that is justified, but Beelzebub says look at the Earth first. If one tries to explain it, of course it is quite easy. If I wish to become impoartial as an observer, I am not going to look at something that is hundred percent partial. Logically, I will be affected immediately, and my observation can never be impartial. When I wish to observe simultaneously, at the moment of the existence, I will not want to look at the mental capacity or activities which are constantly associative, because I cannot have a moment in my observation, when I look at something which has no moment at all, and is made up of time concepts. So one says observation should take place in that what takes place on the Earth, which is my manifestations of the physical body. It has a good advantage, because because of this, I will be able to acquire a dexterity of what is meant by observation. It simply means I perfect my telescope, and the registration of that what is an objective fact coming now from Earth as a manifestation becomes for the observer what he is looking for, and therefore will give in the mind, if it can function that way, like the little I should, objective facts.

So here is the picture: a certain section of the brain which is not as yet spoiled is simply assigned the duty of becoming the seat of functioning for a little I. I myself, that is, with my wish, create. There are difficulties involved in that kind of a statement, because if I am hundred percent subjective, why should I have the wish for creation of something that is objective? And how can I create it? Because I don't even have the material. I am not on Mars. I am not - - in the state indicated by Mars, which is the requirement of how to observe properly. Mars is a planet. It is sometimes, we call it, a state of _____, a state of being hot under the collar, a state of, at the boiling point, of not boiling over, a state ready to fight but not fighting. This is Mars. It is a planet, and it is an emotional state. When I wish to observe something in me like the little I has to have towards that what it wants to observe a condition of emotion which wishes then to observe as well as it possibly can to the highest possibility of what is the emotional attitude in such an observation process.

So now I have defined what is needed for the acquisition of that kind of a dexterity. There has to be an observer. It is Beelzebub. It is my mind receiving facts of an objective kind. So that that what is now receiving it can start to profit by the information it receives. The object at the other end of the telescope, and the telescope is the method, is of course the Earth, that's my body. I use manifestations of my body as conditions of the Earth, the same way as Beelzebub, when he looks through his

telescope and sees certain things happening on the Earth is describing manifestations of my body as a personality.

You know the difficulties that I have is whenever we start to talk that I will want to introduce whenever I say certain things all kind of facts that are related to it, and then/of course I may go off a little bit from the thread that I want to continue with, but the result is usually I include too many facts and it becomes very confusing. So now when I say what are the manifestations of my body when I compare them to conditions of Earth, Beelzebub comes down in different descents to correct certain conditions on Earth by his presence. What does it mean regarding Work? I observe by means of the little I, and that what is Earth remains unconscious. Don't ever make a mistake: consciousness is not an attribute of the personality. It only exists in the little I which I have tried to create. Being hundred percent subjective, I have to start its creation with an assumption that it exists. As if existing, and then give it the power, as if in that existence, it is already reality. That's all I can do; at most I have a thought about the possibility of objectivity. But as yet I have nothing to build it up with. Again you see I am now interested in telling you about octaves, because it is so beautiful, when you understand what is this little I as a beginning, when you consider the intellectual body as the possibility of the development of an octave starting at Do, this Do happens to be, in a certain scheme or a diagram, on the line which divides the unconscious area from the conscious. And this little Do has two functions. With one

part of the brain, it happens to be the elements or the necessary requirements for our life on Earth, and it looks towards an unconscious area. With an other, very small part, it has a concept of the possibilities of a different kind of life in the sense of consciousness. Gurdjieff calls this the Rites of Caratas. By Caratas is meant the state of harmony which man should attain, and towards which Beelzebub and Hassein go when they want to fly home. The aim of man is to reach the state of Caratas as the result of the harmonious development of himself, and therefore this little I is now trying to indicate where it wants to go, and although it is as if, and although it is practically all subjective, there is a little bit of something that makes it objective. And this objectivity has to be fed, and when it is being fed, it will start to affect the rest of the subjectivity and make that objective. This is the process when the little I starts to grow. It is given work to do, and by means of this work it exercises itself and develops. The work it is given to do is to tell the little I: "Observe me. Do as if you exist. Do as if you register facts about myself, pure and simple objectivity." That what I am, as Earth, as a body, as hundred percent subjective, is not affected by the process of just being observed. Therefore, the personality does not experience any objectivity. It might, after some time, when the objective faculty is sufficiently developed, that then the Earth might receive an impression as if it is being observed. But that's only when the little I starts to look in

the direction of Mars and when I discover a telescope, and not before. And the second possibility is that when the little I has grown out, and then it wants to fulfill its function of going down to Earth in descents, in assisting in the conditions of Earth to help mankind to overcome the difficulties, that then the little I as a form of consciousness, now wants to participate in the manifestations of my personality as it is now behaving. Again I bring the two metaphors together, although the one has a different relationship and relatively is different as compared to the other. But all the time keep him in mind , when one talks about man as he is, he is a little universe, hiw own little Solar System. He has in relation to that what he is made up of a condition of cells which are at certain places functioning as organs. To bring from a larger scheme, the totality of mankind is a body in which each man is a cell. And that therefore, when Beelzebub looks at the Earth, he looks at Earth as populated by mankind. When I look at myself, I look at my body as populated by cells. These kind of relationships of course continue to exist because sometimes it' s clearer in one way and clearer in another, and when it has to apply to both in principle, then one method of looking will have the other method of looking. So, the one thing you have to be very careful about whenever you wish to Work, you give the little I food by considering the possibility that it might function in an objective sense. All one does in one's ordinary personality is to produce the wish to continue that attempt. That's all. As soon as

the attempt is there, it belongs to the experience of the little I. We in unconscious state don't know it. The little I being so small has no power. And the only couple of cells in one's self that do know about this possibility is what Gurdjieff calls magnetic center is for Earth what is magnetic pole; it is the center of the Earth--not physical center: it is the center of attraction, it is the center of the balance. Magnetic center in man is the central point where all four--you might say at the point of a cross--will reach what is for man the reality of his life. Again I have to be careful because I want to say now that that what is the reality is the infinity of man, and that what is infinity is his life. But you say that is again a little philosophy, and it would take several sentences to explain it. But it has to be explained, that there is a wish in man to create a little I for a purpose. This comes from magnetic center, magnetic center realizing that life is imprisoned in a human being, wishes to be free, and that what I call the bondage of Earth, is simply that man in his manifestation and his habits, has covered up that what is the reality of himself in such a way that he himself doesn't know it, and only at certain moments os a flash of insight.

Now we go back again. When I start to function, it is separate from all other functions of the personality. This has to be clear: it is separated from; otherwise it couldn' t exist. And at the same time it is related by means of the telescope, which is the method of Work, which for the object becomes that what is magnetic center wishing to be set free. When this magnetic center

wishes to create the little I in order to be the helper outside of the prison, to enable it to open the doors of the prison. If you now see that this kind of a picture, when a man is, in his mind, and the particular patterns of mind which I say is still virgin field--it's not spoiled as yet,-starts to function and wishes to create an objective faculty, that the constant growth of this objective faculty is the result of my wish to Work, and then making out of my noticing of my aliveness in the ordinary sense an awareness in which that what is being observed becomes impartial to that what is. Or, to say it the other way, that what is is acceptable the way it is, without wishing to change it.

Now this is Work. And that of course we leave to a variety of different considerations, and that there are many ways of also looking at it, and where it will lead to is sometimes, you might say, infinity. Nevertheless, this is the foundation, and to that one has to return constantly, and never to forget that that is a necessity of discussion, and that each time that when, if you are ever in your group, you are not relating anything regarding the wish to Work and the results of it, and the obstacles that are in the way when you try to Work, you are talking nonsense, and it shouldn't be allowed. You can talk a little bit about theory, and maybe, once in awhile, once in a blue moon, hydrogen. But for the rest, you talk about your own experience--you do not talk about someone else's experience because you don' t know, and only to the extent that the result he reaches may be of use to you--and that each time you have a meeting, you go home with a desire to do Work. If a group is

not inspirational enough for that purpose, it is not a group. A group comes together in order to exchange ideas which to some extent are clear and to some extent are still questions, and that sometimes someone in a group may have had a similar experience and may have come to a conclusion, or, has a way of looking at it, and then perhaps can explain a little bit of his own experience. And of course one goes home hoping to imitate him. And that's already bad. Because then you start to look for something that you really don't know what you're looking for, but it has to be something that is the description what someone else experienced.

The second thing you have to keep in mind is whenever you talk about consciousness, you talk about something that does not exist in the beginning and that you cannot describe.

The third is that that what is being observed remains unconscious all throughout, until the time that Beelzebub comes down to Earth. And that is another step. We call it participation, and in the line of octaves it belongs to the Re of that particular Do Re Me triad. Do is observation, impartiality, simultaneity, if possible at the same time of all three existing. But when I say it in the way that hundred percent observation is impartial and hundred percent impartiality is simultaneity, and you see there is a logical sequence of growth, and it may take a long time before all three exist. And the only possibility for that is again, that if they happen to be at a certain moment like a flash existing, then at that time all three can exist. All right?

Now, any more questions?

QUESTION: Yes. Are there any cases of objective art in recent times?

MR. NYLAND: We don't know. It is very difficult, you see. In recent times? Do you think that there are in old times? Do you think there are?. . .

QUESTION: Well, I understand the Taj Mahal, and the . . .

MR. NYLAND: Yeah. Have you seen it?

QUESTION: No, I haven't . . .

MR. NYLAND: No. Have you seen any? Of objective art?

QUESTION: Well, I think by El Greco and Blake possibly.

MR. NYLAND: No, I don't think so. I think there's still personal interpretation. No, the requirements for objective art is that everybody sees it and understands it and is affected, not necessarily lightning, but it has to make an impression on every person. Then it becomes objective. It is very difficult. Objectivity of course also means that when someone has a fact, it has to be a fact anytime, eternally. So objective art is also eternal, and it is not somewhere it belongs now, or as it belonged in the past, it is there as a creation of something that always has existed, but now it takes on that form.

QUESTION: Well, the Taj Mahal and the old art, is that modifiable

today?

MR. NYLAND: I think it is effective enough, for those who are more or less pure, but I think that the people who look at it are so spoiled. You see, for objective art you also have to have an observer who is objective. That is where the difficulty comes in. Otherwise one is color blind. It's nice to theorize about it and to say what is really objectivity in art, when all personal elements have been eliminated.

QUESTION: There's nothing today?

MR. NYLAND: That' s right. Not that I can . You're quite right. That is perhaps unfortunate, but unless one can lose one's life you will never find it, not even in art.

QUESTION: Literature . . . would Nicoll's books be considered objective art?

MR. NYLAND: No. Nicoll certainly is a very bad example. I think it's the most personal interpretation of Gurdjieff ever written. I think it' s terribly bad and very misleading.

QUESTION: How about Balzac's Seraphita?

MR. NYLAND: That's different. Because Balzac had certain qualities that at certain times he could say; so had Blake at certain times. But it does not mean that he was that way all the time, or that he

as a manifestation of a human being was that ~~way~~. He only was that at that moment when he happened to either draw or happened to write. How was he _____ respectfully as a husband?

QUESTION: William Blake?

MR. NYLAND: Yes.

QUESTION: He was a good husband.

MR. NYLAND: Was he?

QUESTION: From the biographies.

MR. NYLAND: I don't think he was such a good husband. (Laughter) My statement is fully as bad as yours. Because we really don't know. And the biographer usually _____. No, we really don't know very much. Because even the /at/ times when we live with each other, we don't know what we are. You know, you appear to be very nice at the present time. How the hell do I know what you're like tomorrow morning? You know, it is so difficult to have any kind of a judgment, and only for oneself, and even that kind of a truth, as I said before, one doesn't want to admit. I think it's speculation, yes, it's interesting, and it would be very nice to know why Beethoven was the way he was, and certainly he was for me not a harmonious man. And at the same time when he can write the Ninth Symphony, (it is beautiful, you know, "Freude" and so forth, etc. _____ in the Ninth Symphony. _____ the choir, in that. It is something that is absolutely out of this world.

QUESTION: Mr. Gurdjieff speaks of Da Vinci. Does that mean he came close to objective consciousness?

MR. NYLAND: Who? Da Vinci? _____ Oh, Da Vinci.

QUESTION: Yes. He mentions him in his book.

MR. NYLAND: He mentions him because he was much more of an all-around man, and therefore a person who has many facets and has dexterity _____, he becomes because of that more objective than someone who only has one or who has none. . The reason is that if one has a dexterity, you're no better than anyone else, and after you're through, also for yourself _____, it means that whenever you then do, it is perfect, that noone, not even God, can tell you to improve on it. You' re objective. When Ouspensky talks of an Obyvatel, the simple man who has one trade, in that sense is objective. The person who lives in life and experiences a great many things, at the end of his life has to become more objective, because he is not longer interested in that because he knows. For that reason he can be objective. The trouble is we don't live long enough. If we were as old as Methuselah, all of us would be objective _____. If our time limit were projected against the Earth's time, then the Earth also would become objective, from our standpoint.

QUESTION: Is the time so important - _____ you live, instead of the length of your life?

MR. NYLAND: I don't think it is important, and only that, as far as our ordinary lifetime's concerned, we spend so much in ordinary experiences which are detours, that we have not much time left, and if we are spending it in an unconscious way, we have to undo certain things to decrystallize whatever is unconscious. And that takes time, because the longer one lives the more (involved?) we become. The more I remain attached to it.

QUESTION: Well, sometimes the long life is not the better.

MR. NYLAND: I don't know. It all depends how much life there has been. You know I think that many people die _____, quite early, so of course from that standpoint it is not desirable because they don't even know what it is yet. I think there are people who live for a very, very long time, because they want to, and that for them life is much too short.

QUESTION: Does everyone _____ the time of their death?

MR. NYLAND: No, I don't think so. Ouspensky says somewhere it would be nice for a man to know when he will die, and I think he is entitled to it. The conscious man will know when he dies.

QUESTION: Will we know subconsciously . . .?

MR. NYLAND: Subconsciously? No. There's no definition for subconscious. It is outside of our consciousness. It is only when you bring it to consciousness that subconsciousness can be defined.

QUESTION: Well, I guess the idea is to raise all of our subconsciousnesses to consciousness.

MR. NYLAND: Well, whatever you call subconscious. If it is buried, you see, if it is the same kind of thing we talked about, of this virgin possibility which is not used now, I can call it subconscious. And in that way of course it is a good word. But I call it subconscious because I don't know anything about it, and it grows out into consciousness and then I say that it is worth more, therefore, where it came from, it is worth less. So it must be so. But you see again I don't know that. I only know my own life mental function I call it my consciousness and I know by flashes and perhaps because of Work what might be called real consciousness. But the other two I don't know. I don't know sleep, and only what I remember, and I don't know cosmic consciousness because I'm not there. But I have ideas about it. That I think is a facility of the human mind.

We're getting towards the end of this tape, I see. Huh? Are you already at the end? Practically.

Tomorrow we meet again at eight o'clock. It will be a little bit more of an open, anyone who wishes to come, and then I hope that with this little expose of tonight, that there is something clear, and that for that reason you will have questions. . . .